

VETOES

FOR CHILDREN BY EACH LOCAL INTERAGENCY ADVISORY COUNCIL;

(8) PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO LOCAL COUNCILS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING; AND

(9) MAINTAIN COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SPECIAL SECRETARY FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES AND WITH OTHER CHILD RELATED COMMITTEES.

(B) THE INTERAGENCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION SHALL REPORT ITS FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNOR BY JUNE 30 EACH YEAR.

(C) THE STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE SHALL BE PROVIDED BY THE MARYLAND STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect July 1, 1990. It shall remain effective for a period of 3 years, and at the end of June 30, 1993, and with no further action required by the General Assembly, this Act shall be abrogated and of no further force and effect.

May 25, 1990

The Honorable R. Clayton Mitchell, Jr.
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In accordance with Article II, Section 17 of the Maryland Constitution, I have today vetoed House Bill 224.

House Bill 224 would eliminate a provision in current law that requires a party in a paternity proceeding to subpoena a doctor or technician from a blood testing laboratory if the party desires to cross-examine the doctor or technician. The bill substitutes language that requires the party to notify the laboratory by certified mail that the presence of a doctor or technician is required at trial. The bill would establish that to be included on the list of approved laboratories provided by the Child Support Enforcement Administration (CSEA) to the courts, a laboratory is deemed to have consented to provide a doctor or technician to testify at trial.

Last year I signed Senate Bill 46, now Chapter 546 of the Laws of Maryland 1989. That bill amended § 5-1029 of the Family Law Article to permit a court to admit the laboratory report of a blood test without the presence of the doctor or technician that prepared the report. Last year's legislation also provided that when a report is admitted into evidence, the doctor or technician who prepared the report is subject to cross-examination if subpoenaed.